

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Serial No. 10/031,872
Sughrue Ref: Q68112

REMARKS

Claims 19-33 are all the claims pending in the application. Claim 19 is the only independent claim. Applicant notes that dependent claims 20 and 33 have been withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected species. The rest of the claims have been examined.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to new Figures 28 and 29,. The Examiner alleges that these drawings include new matter. As such, Applicant has canceled Figs. 28 and 29 and has removed any reference to these drawings from the specification.

In addition, the Examiner has objected to the drawings due to several minor informalities. In response, Applicant has amended the Figures by modifying or deleting reference numbers.

For example, reference numbers 48 have been deleted from the Figures.

Applicant has added a description to the specification at paragraph 62 discussing the entry M and pump P shown in Fig. 21.

With respect to Figs. 17-20, Applicant has changed the reference numbers 26A, 26B to 26A', 26B', respectively, and further has changed the reference numbers 23A-D to 26.

With respect to element 67, reference number 67 has been added to Fig. 26. This amendment is consistent with the discussion at paragraph 60 of the specification that the element 67 can be one or several of element 68.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Serial No. 10/031,872
Sughrue Ref: Q68112

Finally, Applicant respectfully notes that there is no element 36 in Fig. 14, that reference numbers 43' and 43'' are used for the embodiments shown in Figs. 22-24 and Fig. 25, respectively, and that reference numeral 24 D is already used in Fig. 20.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the drawing objection.

Specification

In addition, Applicant has made several minor amendments to the drawings and has amended the specification so that the language of the specification is consistent with that of the drawings. The amendments to the specification are shown hereinabove. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the specification.

Claims Objections

The Examiner has objected to the claims, alleging minor informalities and requesting that stylistic amendments be made to the claims. In response, Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the claims.

Claims Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 21-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In addition, Claims 19 and 21-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite.

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Serial No. 10/031,872
Sughrue Ref: Q68112

Claims 19 and 21-24

With respect to claims 19-27, 30, and 32, the Examiner has suggested several minor changes to the claims that would overcome the rejections. Therefore, Applicant has amended the claims in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 28 and 31

With respect to claims 28 and 31, Applicant has amended these claims so that they recite --said one of said conduits is connected to one of the two central actuating elements and the other of said conduits is connected to the other of the two central actuating elements-- in order to clarify the scope of these claims.

Claim 29

With respect to claim 29, Applicant has amended this claim to recite that the recited "means" is for introducing pressurized gaseous or hydraulic fluid to the central cylinder, and for draining the central cylinder. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment is not new matter and is supported at least by the non-limiting embodiments of this claim, shown in Figs. 21, 23, and 24.

In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections of the claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 19, 21, 22, 25, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over newly applied, but previously cited Heyring et al. (WO 95/23076) in view of previously applied Sakai (US 5,486,018). Claims 23, 24, 27, 28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35

TIN-28-2004 15:27

SHERIFF MION PLLC

202 293 7860 P 23

PAGE 23/23 * RCVD AT 6/28/2004 3:20:55 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/6 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:202 293 7860 * DURATION (mm-ss):06-52- JAM